Master in Teaching Program
The Evergreen State College

Standard V Submission
May 29, 2009

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# Board Comments on The Evergreen State College
## 4/7/09

General comments

Overall, the Board response to this proposal was positive. They stated that the proposal was a thoughtful document that provided insight into your program. These areas were noted as strengths of the proposal:

- The level of extensive, specific documentation
- The coordination of student-based and teacher-based evidence
- The EALR Project—the identification of six important purposes directly related to Standard V.

Areas for improvement

- No areas were noted

# Standard V Program Re-approval Template

Submit completed form to your liaison by June 1, 2009.

Institution: The Evergreen State College

Date: 5/28/09

Dean/Director: Dr. Sherry Walton, Director Signature _____

**What are the major examples of evidence in your program for Standard 5.1: Knowledge of Subject Matter and Curriculum Goals? Please be as specific as possible in describing the evidence.**

| Criteria - *Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:* | Teacher-Based Evidence<br>*Teacher demonstrates capacity to provide effective learning experiences.* | Student-Based Evidence<br>*Students demonstrate engagement in effective learning opportunities.* |
|---|---|---|
| **A. Content driven.** All students develop understanding and problem-solving expertise in the content area(s) using reading, written and oral communication, and technology.<br><br>**B. Aligned with curriculum standards and outcomes.** All students know the learning targets and their progress towards meeting them.<br><br>**C. Integrated across content areas.** All students learn subject matter content that integrates mathematical, scientific, and aesthetic reasoning. | A. EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning project (see description at end of chart**); inter-disciplinary unit curriculum lesson plans; content area and technology lesson plans and rubrics; teaching opportunities within the MIT program<br><br>B. EALR self assessment (candidates self-assess knowledge on relevant EALR categories and make plans for professional development); objectives on lesson plans; PPA; MIT Student Teaching Rubric; EALR/Positive Impact on Student Teaching project (see description at end of chart **)<br><br>C. Integrated Arts projects; inter-disciplinary curriculum project; web-posted lesson plans; MIT student teaching rubric and lesson plans; PPA | A – C.<br><br>Mini-unit assessments and analysis of student work in spring Year 1 practicum<br><br>Student interviews during Year 1 practicum about literacy, math, science, arts, and social sciences concepts<br><br>EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning project ** (Fall and Spring Student Teaching in Year 2) – student work, assessments and analysis of student work, Positive Impact interviews and data |

**What are the major examples of evidence in your program for Standard 5.2: Knowledge of Teaching? Please be as specific as possible in describing the evidence.**

| Criteria - *Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:* | Teacher-Based Evidence<br>*Teacher demonstrates capacity to provide effective learning experiences.* | Student-Based Evidence<br>*Students demonstrate engagement in effective learning opportunities.* |
|---|---|---|
| **A. Informed by standards-based assessment.** All students benefit from learning that is systematically analyzed using multiple formative, summative, and self-assessment strategies.<br>**B. Intentionally planned.** All students benefit from standards-based planning that is personalized.<br>**C. Influenced by multiple instructional strategies.** All students benefit from personalized instruction that addresses their ability levels and cultural and linguistic backgrounds.<br><br>**D. Informed by technology.** All students benefit from instruction that utilizes effective technologies and is | **A – C**<br>• EALR self-assessment<br>• Year 1 mini-unit lesson plans and reflections<br>• EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning project **<br>• MIT student teaching rubric & PPA<br>• Student teaching lesson plans that include attention to English Language Learners and students with special needs accompanied by reflections on practice, impact, and implications for next steps<br>• Candidates' narrative self-evaluations<br>• Written and performance assessments of candidates' abilities to administer and interpret a range of assessments, including reading and math assessments<br>• Written documentation of candidates' abilities to conduct and interpret concept-based interviews, interest interviews, and subject matter autobiographies – e.g. math and social studies<br><br>**D.** Assessments and candidate reflections:<br>• Power Point presentations | **A - D**<br>Systematic gathering of student evidence re learning goals, importance of the goals, progress, next steps, and resources during practica (Year 1 winter and spring quarters) connected to on-campus subject matter workshops<br><br>Mini-Unit Teaching (spring quarter Year 1) assessments and analysis of student work with implications for next steps<br><br>EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning project ** (fall and spring Student Teaching in Year 2) – student work, assessments and analysis of student work, Positive Impact interviews and data<br><br>Student interviews during Year 1 practica about literacy, arts, math, science, and social sciences concepts |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| designed to create technologically proficient learners. | • web page development<br>• video editing<br>• on-line discussion boards<br>• internet curriculum projects<br>• technology portfolios<br>• use of technology such as SmartBoards and Geometer Sketchpad | |

**What are the major examples of evidence in your program for Standard 5.3: Knowledge of Learners and their Development in Social Contexts? Please be as specific as possible in describing the evidence.**

**What would be the major examples of evidence in your program for**

| Criteria - *Evidence of teacher candidate practice reflect planning, instruction, and communication that is:* | Teacher-Based Evidence<br>*Teacher demonstrates capacity to provide effective learning experiences.* | Student-Based Evidence<br>*Students demonstrate engagement in effective learning opportunities.* |
|---|---|---|
| **A. Learner centered.** All students engage in a variety of culturally responsive, developmentally, and age appropriate strategies.<br>**B. Classroom/school centered.** Student learning is connected to communities within the classroom and the school, including knowledge and skills for working with others.<br>**C. Family/Neighborhood centered.** Student learning is informed by collaboration with families and neighborhoods.<br>**D. Contextual community centered.** All students are prepared to be responsible citizens for an environmentally sustainable, globally interconnected, and diverse society. | • First year integrative teaching/learning/schooling paper (informed by workshops and readings from multiple perspectives)<br>• Lesson plans and reflections<br>• *Teachers as Collaborative Partners* project (community surveys)<br>• In-school interviews with specialists<br>• Various art projects<br>• MIT Student Teaching Rubric & PPA<br>• Teaching for Social Justice workshops and projects – cultural encapsulation statements, projects related to neighborhood, community resources, and funds of knowledge<br>• Integrated curriculum development projects focused on sustainability<br>• Models of Teaching focused on sustainability<br>• EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning Project ** with evidence of | • Systematic gathering of student evidence re learning goals, importance of the goals, progress, next steps, and resources during practica (Year 1 winter and spring quarters) connected to on-campus workshops about developmentally and culturally appropriate learning experiences<br>• Mini-Unit Teaching (spring quarter Year 1) assessments and analysis of student work with implications for next steps<br>• EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning project ** (fall and spring Student Teaching in Year 2) – student work, assessments and analysis of student work, Positive Impact interviews and data<br>• Student interviews during Year 1 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | inclusion of families and communities in development and implementation of lessons | practica about literacy, arts, math, science and social sciences concepts |

**What are the major examples of evidence in your program for Standard 5.4: Understanding of Teaching as a Profession? Please be as specific as possible in describing the evidence.**

| Criteria - *Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:* | Teacher-Based Evidence<br>*Teacher demonstrates capacity to provide effective learning experiences.* |
|---|---|
| **A. Informed by professional responsibilities and policies.** All students benefit from a collegial and professional school setting.<br>**B. Enhanced by a reflective, collaborative, professional growth-centered practice.** All students benefit from the professional growth of their teachers.<br>**C. Informed by legal and ethical responsibilities.** All students benefit from a safe and respectful learning environment. | • Practicum (Spring quarter, Year 1) mini-unit lesson plans, reflections on practice and impact, implications for professional development and feedback from classroom teacher<br>• MIT Student Teaching Rubric – filled out by candidate, classroom mentor, and college supervisor<br>• PPA<br>• Cultural encapsulation reflections<br>• Two candidate portfolios that contain lesson plans, EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning Project **, reflections on practice and impact<br>• Professional Growth Plans based on evaluations of fall quarter EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning projects<br>• Written assessments about identification and reporting of suspected abuse; knowledge of teacher rights and responsibilities; knowledge of special education laws and response to students' needs |

**Explanation of EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning Project

The EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning Project

During each of two student teaching experiences, the teacher candidate is required to plan and implement a unit of study approved by the classroom mentor teacher called the EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning Project. Through this project, the teacher candidate systematically documents the learning of a representative sample of students and the teacher candidate's positive impact on student learning. The project is typically completed during the solo student teaching experience or during the phase of co-teaching when the candidate is acting as lead teacher. The teacher candidate selects 3-5 students of various ability levels and closely monitors the students' development toward mastery of some of the unit's Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs), Grade Level Expectations

(GLEs), Performance Expectations (PEs), or Frameworks. The planning of the curricular unit, its assessment, the teacher candidate's positive impact on student learning, and the teacher candidate's reflections are documented through this project. The purpose of this project is to demonstrate positive impact on K-12 student growth in the chosen EALRs as a result of the teacher candidate's teaching.

***Assessment Documentation***

This is primarily a ***student*** assessment project. It determines students' growth toward target EALRs, GLEs, PEs, and/or Frameworks, as well as the candidates' positive impact on student learning. The core assessment documentation includes:

• Pre-assessment instruments and results, showing each selected student's knowledge and skills in relation to the unit's EALRs, GLEs, PEs, or Frameworks;

• Formative assessment instruments and assessment results showing student learning at multiple points during the delivery of the curricular unit;

• Summative assessment instruments and assessment results documenting student learning at the conclusion of the unit;

• A written narrative, supported by the assessment data, which describes the unit's impact on student learning. This narrative includes information gathered through interviews, tapes, or student work such as exit tasks described below as well as the candidate's reflections about how this information might inform his/her teaching.

• Written notes from interviews, tapes, or student work such as exit tasks with each of the 3 – 5 targeted students (two sets of data per student gathered at different times during the project) describing their responses to the following questions (adjusted appropriately for age level): What learning outcome are you working toward? Why is this learning important? How is your learning being evaluated? What progress have you made with regards to this learning? How do you know? What steps would you need to take next? What resources might you use?

The EALR/Positive Impact project is an essential aspect of the MIT program, serving six important purposes related to Standard V.

1. First, the project assesses candidates' abilities to articulate clear learning targets aligned with the EALRs, GLEs, and Performance Expectations.

2. Second, it assesses candidates' abilities to use pre and formative assessments to shape learning experiences to meet students' varied needs.

3. A third purpose is to assess candidates' skills in using post assessment to determine students' progress toward the learning targets.

4. Fourth, the project provides an opportunity for candidates to refine their reflective skills and to use data to articulate what worked in a lesson and what needs to be changed in order to support students' learning.

5. The fifth purpose of the project is to support the candidate in collecting evidence to show that they have met state requirements embedded in the *Pedagogy Assessment.*

6. Finally, the project allows the candidate to demonstrate her/his *Positive Impact on Student Learning*. Specifically, the candidates must demonstrate the ability to use ***student*** "voice", NOT the candidates' attitudes, lesson plans, instructional skills, etc., to demonstrate that the ***student*** can:

   - identify what she/he is learning and why the learning is important
   - explain where she/he is in the process and what her/his strategies, next steps, and resources are.

a) In a narrative of 7-10 pages, describe how your program has changed to meet the requirements of Standard V in the following areas:
   - Course content
   - Field experiences
   - P-12 district/school partnerships
   - Faculty development

   In areas where no changes were necessary, briefly indicate why.

**Course Content**

The MIT program is founded upon a strong theory base which focuses on substantial involvement with schools and sensitivity to multicultural and linguistic diversity, introduces a variety of instructional strategies, emphasizes new technology and research, and maintains collaboration with K-12 teachers and administrators. Program content is directly related to the Conceptual Framework and is informed by the knowledge and skills of the faculty and candidates in each cohort, research in education, and by the WACs, standards, and endorsement competencies specified by the State of Washington and by the standards of recognized professional organizations.

The program mirrors the original alternative nature of the college with its cross-curricular, interdisciplinary programs, guiding questions or themes around which to structure learning opportunities, the absence of separate academic departments, and an emphasis on primary as well as secondary source learning materials, interactive student-teacher dialogue, graduate-level writing skills and narrative evaluations in place of letter grades. Like the undergraduate programs at Evergreen, the MIT program is organized around compelling themes and questions explored from multiple disciplinary perspectives rather than as series of discrete classes. Through exploring these themes and questions, candidates improve their content knowledge and pedagogical strategies as they participate in a wide range of community-building activities, small-group seminars, teaching opportunities, workshops, hands-on field experiences, and group problem solving. These experiences reinforce critical and reflective thinking and demonstrate important principles of effective and meaningful classroom teaching. Furthermore, they help candidates become knowledgeable, competent professionals who can assume leadership roles in curriculum development that focuses on student learning, child advocacy, assessment and anti-bias work.

The above context is important for understanding why we cannot provide a list courses with changes in content. Each two-year cohort draws on the knowledge and strengths of its faculty and candidates to determine the most useful ways to address the conceptual framework of the program and the requirements of the standards that govern teacher preparation programs in Washington. The faculty's assessment of our program indicated that, in many ways, we were already meeting the majority of the requirements of the new Standard V. However, our discussions about how we can improve our work to better meet the requirements include commitments to:

a) Creating a more deliberate and increased focus on the specifics of family and community involvement in the development and implementation of curriculum. Along with the increased focus on family and community involvement is an emphasis on situated learning, a social process whereby knowledge is co-constructed; learning is situated in a specific context and embedded within a particular social and physical environment. We will address these goals through choices of seminar books, workshop foci, and the development of clearer guidelines, shared across cohorts, to improve our current community-based projects which are intended to help candidates better understand the neighborhoods in which they student teach and the funds of knowledge available in those communities.
b) Expanding our current efforts, across cohorts, to integrate more experiences and information about effective strategies to support the learning of English Language Learners. We will seek help from our recent hire in ESL, alumni, and other practicing teachers to achieve this goal.
c) Helping each other develop our skills, across cohorts, to support candidates in learning how to integrate the arts across content areas. We will draw on models from two recent cohorts as we pursue this goal.
d) Expanding our own understanding of sustainability and incorporating that understanding into program themes and questions, seminar book choices, and candidate assignments. We have become members of TOTOS, were represented by one of our faculty at a recent conference on sustainability, and are working with faculty in the undergraduate sustainability program to expand our current focus on diversity to include environmental and global connectedness.
e) Extending our exploration and uses of technology beyond our current expectations.
f) Using candidates' 2nd year fall quarter EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning Project to guide reflection during winter quarters and to shape candidates' work on professional growth plans. We began this work winter quarter 2009 and will draw on faculty and candidates' feedback to adjust the experience for winter quarter 2010.

**Field Experiences**

Since the program's inception, MIT candidates have always been involved in extensive field experiences. One of the strengths of the program identified by alumni and public school principals is the plan for, and extensive nature of, experiences in public schools. All candidates, regardless of endorsement area, spend time in rural, urban, and suburban schools and in elementary, middle school, and high school classrooms during the first quarter of the program. In the second and third quarters of the program, candidates work in one classroom in their endorsement areas under the guidance of a certified teacher. Each quarter of the first year, candidates spend approximately 40 – 50 guided hours a quarter working in a public school classroom. MIT faculty have had several goals for the field experiences including:

b) helping candidates become familiar with the differing cultures of schools;
c) improving candidates' abilities to differentiate between observation and description as compared to assumption and projection;
d) guiding candidates to become familiar with a range of teachers' classroom management and questioning strategies;

e) helping candidates become familiar with policies related to the use of technology and working with students with special needs and students for whom English in not their first language;
f) providing ways for candidates to become familiar with students' communities;
g) supporting candidates in developing skills in working one-on-one with students, in small groups, and with the whole class;
h) shaping opportunities for candidates to gain skills in planning and implementing conceptually-based, connected lessons that address appropriate EALRs;
i) helping candidates develop professional attributes.

In the second year of the program, candidates complete two, ten-week student teaching (intern) experiences. One of these is in an urban setting to provide significant experiences with diverse populations of students. In both quarters, teacher candidates are expected to take full responsibility for the classroom for a minimum of three weeks (for a total of six weeks) or as the lead teacher in situations where the co-teaching model is used.

The above description captures the many ways in which MIT's field experiences already address the new Standard V requirements. In this program, candidates have traditionally benefited from the opportunity to regularly consider and critique the similarities and differences between their on-campus and field-based work. Candidates were expected to enhance their understanding of technology, classroom management, lesson planning and implementation, and effective strategies to use with English language learners and students with special needs through their field experiences. All of these are included in the new requirements.

Thus, our fundamental approach to field experiences remains the same. However, we are adjusting our requirements for field experiences in the following ways to address the new Standard V:

a) Creating specific opportunities for candidates to gather and analyze student data from their practicum placements during winter and spring of Year 1 to help them understand and document positive impact on student learning. We have created guided workshops to help candidates evaluate their collection and assessment of evidence (see attached assessment assignment titled *Mini EALR/Positive Impact Project Evaluation Packet)*. Based on this project, candidates will be assisted in making improvements in their processes in preparation for the EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning Project, which is required in both student teaching experiences.
b) Adjusting our previous EALR Project (please see description of current project on pages four to six) to ensure that:
    - candidates systematically collect student evidence of positive impact,
    - candidates use student data to shape learning experiences, and,
    - candidates' portfolios are assessed through a standard rubric to evaluate their abilities to understand and make effective use of student data (see attached rubric).

These adjustments were implemented this year. The project was re-named the EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning Project and new guidelines and rubrics were developed that incorporated the previous project guidelines, MIT's Student Teaching Rubric, and materials from *The Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality Project*. Candidates' work, faculty feedback, and PEAB members' feedback from blind reviews of the projects will be used to continue to fine-tune the project and its assessment.

## P-12 District/school Partnerships

The MIT program has had a long-standing relationship with Lincoln Elementary School in Olympia through the Small Democratic Schools League. All of our candidates have at least one experience at Lincoln because of their sophisticated enactment of developmentally appropriate learning, attention to developing self-motivated and self-managed learners, and use of democratic classroom management. In the fall of 2008, we extended our partnership to include a co-teaching model based on St. Cloud University's work. Following the student teaching quarter, we met with the principal, our PEAB chair, and the teachers involved to debrief the experience. The feedback was positive; we plan to implement the co-teaching model at Lincoln again in fall 2009.

Based on that work, and at the invitation of St. Martin's, we met with the staff at Garfield Elementary School in Olympia to discuss enacting a co-teaching model. We have also talked with the Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources in the North Thurston School District about working with them on both clustering student teachers and enacting a co-teaching model. We are waiting to hear from Garfield and from North Thurston.

One of our faculty has been extensively involved with the Shelton schools helping teachers develop more effective and research-based models for teaching math. That work is continuing. The director of MIT serves on the site council for a local elementary school and is collaborating with the school to improve services for students with special needs and the RTI program for reading. Another important collaboration began this quarter through placing candidates seeking endorsements in the sciences and arts with highly qualified and National Board Certified Teacher mentors. Those teachers and the Evergreen faculty member are working collaboratively to help the candidates develop their content specific pedagogical skills.

Finally, the MIT faculty and staff have an excellent working relationship with the teachers and administrators on our PEAB. The PEAB members take an active role in reviewing program documents and curriculum, spending time with our candidates, mentoring student teachers, and helping shape program decisions through their recommendations. The most recent significant change occurred as a result of the PEAB's recommendation that we add a reading endorsement to our program. That endorsement was approved by the PESB earlier this year.

## Faculty Development

MIT faculty work on teams of three. As part of their work, each team meets weekly to discuss relevant texts and research and to help each other expand and improve their instructional planning and facilitation of learning experiences. This type of faculty development is on going and emergent. In these weekly meetings the faculty: engage in extensive interdisciplinary planning in the areas of curriculum development, assessment, and student advisement; discuss candidate feedback collected during and at the culmination of each quarter's work; strategize about how to be responsive to candidates' needs, requests, and areas of expertise; carefully discuss ways to integrate research, teacher pedagogy and methods and assessment approaches while being mindful of the students in candidates' field experiences; and design and redesign candidate assignments and assessment rubrics in ways that are mindful of state content area and grade level standards. In addition, the faculty meet as a whole group several times each quarter for updates and discussions about PESB expectations (e.g., changes in Standard V) and initiatives such as the co-teaching model, as well as discussions about learning, teaching, research, and

emerging interests. Individual faculty make decisions about other types of professional development based on their self-evaluations of their teaching strengths and areas of need and based on their research or pedagogical interests.

b) In no more than three pages, describe the *process* used to engage program personnel in reviewing, rethinking, and revising the program.

MIT faculty members and staff meet together approximately once a month to share information, discuss the program, and make decisions about necessary program adjustments. Standard V has been the primary topic of conversation since the review of the standard began. To support our ability to engage in useful and effective discussions, faculty members and staff have:

- received copies of pertinent documents from OSPI,
- attended relevant state meetings and conferences,
- participated in revising the EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning project guidelines and assessment rubrics,
- read and responded to drafts of Standard V and proposals for meeting the new requirements, and,
- engaged in conversations about ways to improve our abilities to help our candidates better meet the needs of their students.

All proposals and commitments, including the current document, were read, discussed, revised, and accepted by all members of the MIT faculty and staff.

In addition, our PEAB has been actively engaged this year in discussing the new Standard V requirements and making recommendations. These recommendations were forwarded to the faculty for inclusion in their discussions. Further, the PEAB participated in a blind review of a sample of the candidates' EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning Projects. Their evaluations and suggestions were returned to the faculty who used the information to clarify for candidates the expectations and organization of the project.

c) In no more than two pages, describe the key strategies by which candidates will develop capacity to analyze and respond to student-based evidence. Please attach three samples of assignments or assessments that represent those strategies.

We have already begun to include workshops during Year 1 of the program that specify what student-based evidence includes, how to gather the data, and how to analyze it. We have also developed a handout for mentor teachers about positive impact on student learning that supervising faculty discuss with the mentor and candidate before student teaching begins.

The candidates will participate in workshops designed to help them understand the purposes and requirements of collecting, analyzing, and making use of student data. They will then have three formal opportunities to develop their skills and demonstrate their ability to analyze and use student-based evidence.

1. During their spring quarter practicum of Year 1, candidates teach one or two 3-day mini-units, collect pre-and post assessment data about the specified GLEs, PEs, or EALRs, collect information about students' understanding of what the learning goal is, why they think the goal is important, what progress they're making, and next steps and resources. Beginning this quarter (spring, 2009), candidates will also participate in workshops designed to help them learn to analyze this data and use the information to make instructional decisions.

2. Based on this instruction, the candidates will enact more extensive units during both their fall and spring student teaching placements. They will use assessment data and student voice data to complete an EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning Project (see project description on pages 4 - 6 of this document) to meet PPA requirements and to demonstrate their positive impact on student learning.
3. These projects will be assessed using a rubric developed from the MIT Student Teaching rubric, project guidelines, and the work done by the *Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality*. Both faculty and PEAB members will evaluate the fall quarter project. Feedback will be used to improve the candidates' practice in the spring quarter of student teaching.

d) In no more than two pages, describe areas of your revised program that will be a focus of continuing attention and development as you proceed with implementation.

We have begun this year to develop workshops in both Year 1 and Year 2 of the program to systematically help candidates develop an understanding of student-based evidence, how to gather it, how to analyze it, and how to make use of the information in planning for student learning and in planning for candidates' professional development. These workshops will be shared across cohorts, discussed, and refined based on faculty and candidates' experiences and feedback.

Spring quarter 2009 will be the first time we will use the new workshops for our EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning project. Again, based on candidate, faculty, and mentor teacher feedback, we may need to make adjustments. In addition, the new *PPA* may affect the nature of this project. If so, we will need to make adjustments. We will also need to provide faculty development opportunities for faculty who have not yet used our revised approach to the project.

If we pursue a larger scale implementation of the co-teaching model, mentor teachers and MIT student teaching supervisors will need opportunities to become thoroughly familiar with the expectations and processes associated with the model. This would become an on-going professional development need.

Two other important areas for on-going faculty development concern the integration of a more comprehensive approach to diversity through sustainability and the integration of the arts across content areas.

e) Please attach a letter from the PEAB chair that describes the PEAB's involvement in reviewing and revising the program.

# PEAB Letter

May 11, 2009

To: PESB
Re: TESC/MIT PEAB involvement w/ Standard V

The Evergreen MIT PEAB has been regularly updated regarding the changes in Standard V since they were first proposed. This year the primary focus of our PEAB was to review and provide input on Standard V criteria. MIT director Sherry Walton shared samples of assessments, rubrics, and surveys during the revision of Standard V. Drafts of revisions were sent out regularly and well in advance of PEAB meetings so that members had time to review them, and ample time was given members to discuss new requirements and make recommendations. PEAB members were directly involved in reviewing students' EALR/Positive Impact Projects (PIP) and have given feedback to faculty for further revision of criteria and evaluation. Two recent recommendations that the PEAB made based on our review were to standardize the PIP structure and to use a rubric to assess the PIP. Both recommendations were integrated into the PIP plan.

In addition to our review of Standard V, the members of the PEAB have had regular opportunities to make classroom observations and attend candidate presentations during our meeting days, with reflection and discussion time afterwards. The PEAB has found the MIT Faculty to be openly appreciative of our discussions, evaluation, and feedback that take place during the review process of Standard V criteria.

Michi Thacker
Professional Education Advisory Board
Masters in Teaching Program
The Evergreen State College
Olympia, WA

# SAMPLE ASSIGNMENTS/ASSESSMENTS

SAMPLE ASSIGNMENTS/ASSESSMENTS
EXPLANATION

The sample assignments and assessments included in this section were developed to be sequential and cumulative in their effects. Building on a major assessment project previously used during the student teaching quarters of the MIT program, this series of assignments is preceded by on-campus workshops directed at helping candidates understand processes for developing student-centered learning experiences, the role of assessment in teaching and learning, and the nature and purpose of student-based evidence.

1) This series begins during the spring quarter practicum before student teaching to provide candidates a:
   - o field-based opportunity to integrate assessment and positive impact interviews/student work into a short series of lessons conducted in a public school classroom
   - o low-risk opportunity to organize, display, and analyze assessment data and make suggestions about how the data should affect subsequent instructional decisions
   - o structured, on-campus workshops through which they assess other candidates' work, provide feedback, receive feedback from peers and faculty, and identify revisions that would strengthen the candidate's ability to collect, analyze, and make use of student data. (See Mini EALR/Positive Impact Project Evaluation Packet.)

2) The series continues during the fall quarter student teaching experience as a means of further developing and assessing candidates' skills in the planning and implementation of learning experiences and assessments that support student learning. Candidates and faculty use a standard rubric to assess and provide feedback about this project. (See The Evergreen State College, Master in Teaching Program, EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning Project)

3) After fall quarter student teaching, candidates return to campus for a quarter of reflection about their teaching experiences. The next step in this series provides candidates opportunities to:
   - o evaluate and revise their EALR/Positive Impact Projects by using information from faculty, peers, and self-assessment provided through a standard rubric and small group discussions
   - o become familiar with the standards and criteria for the Professional Certificate
   - o use the standards for effective teaching identified and assessed through the project and the ProCert standards and criteria to draft and pursue professional growth plans (See EALR/Positive Impact Project Reflection and Professional Development Plan Assignment.)

4) During candidates' second quarter of student teaching, they complete a second EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning Project, self-assess their effectiveness in gathering, analyzing, and using student-based evidence, and receive formal evaluations from the college faculty.

# ASSIGNMENT 1:

# MINI-EALR/POSITIVE IMPACT PROJECT EVALUATION PACKET

## Spring Quarter, Year 1

**Mini EALR/Positive Impact Project Evaluation Packet**
Completed during Spring Quarter Practicum prior to fall Student Teaching

Through the EALR/Positive Impact Project the Teacher Candidate systematically documents the learning of a representative sample of students during a unit of instruction and her/his positive impact on student learning. The full project is typically done during the solo student teaching experience. **This mini-project** is completed during the quarter prior to student teaching. The Teacher Candidate selects 3-5 students of various ability levels and closely monitors the students' development toward mastery of some of the unit's Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs), Grade Level Expectations (GLEs), Performance Expectations (PEs) or Frameworks. The planning of the curricular unit, its assessment, the teacher candidate's positive impact on student learning, and the teacher candidate's reflections are documented through this project. Lesson planning should follow the guidelines provided in the program. **The purpose of this mini-project is to learn how to determine and demonstrate positive impact on K-12 student growth in the chosen EALRs as a result of the Teacher Candidate's teaching.**

Please include the following items with your Mini-Project write-up.

1. **Lesson Plans**, including all handouts and materials
2. **Pre and post assessments** with answer keys and evaluation scales or rubrics.
3. **A clear table** you create that summarizes students' knowledge/skill demonstrated before and after the lessons.
4. **Students' pre and post assessments, notes from student interviews or students' written responses, analysis of assessments, and analysis for Positive Impact on Student Learning responses.**
    - Based on the PREASSESSMENT: Where were they on the target learning BEFORE you began?
    - Based on the POSTASSESSMENT: Where are they on the target learning after the learning experiences?
    - Based on your notes about interviews with students or students' written responses to Positive Impact questions, how are the students making sense of the learning experiences? That is: What do the students understand the purpose of the task as being? How do they make sense of (i) their skill/knowledge, (ii) what they need to work on? and (iii) strategies for working on those things. (Questions you could ask students: What learning outcome are you working toward? Why is this learning important? How is your learning being evaluated? What progress have you made with regards to this learning? How do you know? What steps would you need to take next? What resources might you use?)
    - Based on the information above, HOW did your teaching influence students' learning?

- Based on their post assessment and their responses to the positive impact questions, what will you do NEXT to help them progress?

5. **TEACHER ASSESSMENT** of your teaching on RUBRIC
6. **SELF ASSESSMENT** of your teaching on RUBRIC
7. **Written self-reflection**. Use the teacher assessment, the self-assessment, and the written peer feedback to inform this final reflection. Include specific feedback comments from each group (teacher, self, peers) and reflection on those comments. Your reflection should also include specific ways in which you would change, or modify this lesson if done again. For instance, instead of saying, “next time I will give more specific directions,” actually write out the directions you would give.

**MINI EALR/POSITIVE IMPACT PROJECT PEER REVIEW FOR** _____(*name)*

(*Hand in this feedback together with write up)*

**Goal: To use peer review of mini-EALR/Positive Impact project write up to help clarify and elaborate where necessary your analysis of student learning and your teaching. To gain ideas for ways to strengthen the analysis of student learning and teaching from a collective identification of strengths people noticed in each other's work. To revise the final reflection and analysis of your teaching using feedback from this session.**

Procedure

1. Get into pairs.
2. Designate a time keeper in the pair. Spend 25 minutes reading and giving feedback to each person's analysis.
3. Come together for 20 minutes and solicit ideas for chart, analysis of teaching, of metacognition, of how to refine teaching practice. (*Remember to listen, reflect on and digest before responding to feedback. Make note of places you could clarify as you discuss work. You have two more opportunities to do this project. This one is a learning opportunity for the next one).*
4. Big idea is how do people determine what learning looks like? What insights do you gain about how to determine learning? What insights have you gained about the role and nature of assessment in your teaching?
5. Identify and revise a couple of areas in the final analysis of your teaching given what you've learned from the feedback. Work on it from 11-12.
6. Hand in complete packet complete with chart, analysis and reflection, student work and peer feedback sheet. Email revision to seminar faculty by noon today.

**WHAT'S THE LEARNING OBJECTIVE?**

**Before you begin to read peer's work, get clear on the learning objective & the focus of the assessment** (i.e. what schema was the teacher trying to stretch through his/her lesson? Put in other words, what knowledge, reasoning or skill was the teacher specifically seeking to develop/complexify?) **What of that knowledge, reasoning and/or skill did the assessment ask students to share?**

**ANALYSIS OF STUDENT LEARNING**

1. **Look for the table that summarizes the pre and post assessment data. How clearly does the table summarize the state of students' knowledge/skill before and after the lesson?**

   - A strength of the table:

   - Spell out 1-2 things that would help clarify the table:

2. **How effectively does analysis capture what did or didn't change in students' conceptions/skill before and after the lesson?**

   - A strength of analysis.

- Spell out 1-2 things that would help clarify or strengthen the analysis.

3. **How effectively does analysis capture students' metacognitive awareness of the lesson and their work on the lesson?** (That is: What did the students understand the purpose of the task as being? How do they make sense of (i) their skill/knowledge, (ii) what they need to work on? and (iii) strategies for working on those things. )

   - A strength of this analysis.

   - If needed, spell out 1-2 things that would help clarify the analysis:

4. **Now take a look at the assessment itself. How effectively does it work as a tool to display students' understanding? How might you revise to better capture the kinds of learning you were aiming for?**

   - A strength of the assessments.

   - If needed, spell out 1-2 things that would help clarify the assessment:

**ANALYSIS OF TEACHING INFORMED BY STUDENT WORK AND LEARNING**

5. **Does the final reflection and analysis address the following questions?**
   - **HOW did your teaching influence students' learning?**
   - **Based on students' post assessment answers, what will you do NEXT to help them progress?**
   - **Your reflection should also include specific ways in which you would change, or modify this lesson and assessment if done again. For instance, instead of saying, "next time I will give more specific directions," actually write out the directions you would give.**

   **How effective is this reflection and analysis?**

   - A strength of this analysis.

   - Spell out 1-2 things that would help clarify or deepen the final reflection

**WHAT YOU LEARNED FROM READING THIS PROJECT**
**1-2 things you learned from reading the mini-EALR write up that you want to remember to try in your own EALR write up or in your future efforts to make sense of student learning:**

**FACULTY EVALUATION OF THREE DAY TEACHING EXPERIENCES – *NAME***

| Criteria | Comments |
|---|---|
| **All components included in unit plan**<br>Checked boxes mean faculty has seen evidence that item is included but is not an indication of quality | ☐ Carefully stepped-out Lesson Plans with SLOs<br>☐ GLE(s), PEs from which lessons are built<br>☐ Pre-assessment<br>☐ Student work or other artifacts of student participation/learning<br>☐ Post-assessment<br>☐ Table that summarizes student knowledge/skill demonstrated before & after lesson<br>☐ Analysis of student learning<br>☐ Analysis of positive impact on student learning (i.e. student metacognitive awareness of purpose of lesson and where they are in their learning, etc)<br>☐ Teacher assessment on rubric<br>☐ Self assessment on rubric |
| Evidence that pre-assessment is connected to the GLEs/PEs/EALRs | |
| Accurate evaluation of pre-assessment data that drives Student Learning Objectives | |
| Lesson activities reflect Student Learning Objectives | |
| Accurate assessment of student learning based on pre-post assessment (and may also include other deliberately collected artifacts of student learning) | |
| Accurate assessment of positive impact on student learning (i.e. student metacognitive awareness of purpose of lesson and where they are in their learning, etc) | |
| Careful reflection on student learning. Reflections should be specific and include evidence of student learning, instruction that supports student learning, or assessment. Ways reflection and analysis took into account:<br>- How teaching influenced learning?<br>- Next steps for teaching informed by post assessment?<br>- Specific ways in which would change, or modify this lesson and assessment if done again. For instance, instead of saying, “next time I will give more specific directions,” actually write out the directions you would give. | |

**Rubrics for teacher and self evaluation of micro-teaching as the first real classroom experience**

ASSESSMENT TOOL FOR MICROTEACHING

Presenter's name: _____ Observed by: _____

FROM: SCORING RUBRIC FOR A STATE PEDAGOGY ASSESSMENT OBSERVATION

Source of Evidence: *Microteaching Observation*

**6.** ***The teacher candidate aligns instruction with the plan and communicates accurate content knowledge.***

| Teaching Elements | Criteria for MET | Rating |
|---|---|---|
| A. Alignment | Classroom instruction is aligned with the instructional plan. | Met Not Met |
| B. Meaningful Opportunities to Learn | Students are learning the key skills - concepts needed to reach the learning targets. | Met Not Met |
| C. Accuracy | The teacher candidate demonstrates accurate knowledge of the content. | Met Not Met |
| D. Interdisciplinary Instruction | Students are engaged in tasks that provide interdisciplinary connections with other subject areas. | Met Not Met |

***7. Students participate in a learning community that supports student learning and well-being.***

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A. Respect | Classroom interactions between teacher - students reflect respect for students. | Met Not Met |

***8. Students engage in learning activities that are based on research and principles of effective practice.***

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A. Questioning and Discussion Techniques | Teacher answers and poses questions in a way that engages students in cooperative discussions that enhance learning, critical thinking, transformative multicultural thinking, and problem solving. | Met Not Met |
| B. Delivery and Pacing | Students engage in learning activities that are: paced appropriately for all students, culturally responsive, and allow for reflection & closure. | Met Not Met |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| C. Active Learning | Students are cognitively engaged in the learning activities. | Met Not Met |

***9. Students experience effective classroom management and discipline.***

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A. Transitions | Teacher helps students move between learning tasks or lesson segments in an efficient manner. | Met Not Met |

***10. The teacher candidate and students engage in activities that assess student learning.***

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A. Alignment | Students engage in assessment activities aligned with learning targets. | Met Not Met |
| B. Multiple Modes and Approaches | Students engage in various assessments that measure their performance relative to the learning targets. | Met Not Met |

Source: The Evergreen State College Student Teaching Rubric

| ELEMENT | Emerging Teacher | Developing Teacher |
|---|---|---|
| **Knowledge of Content** | Candidate displays basic content knowledge but cannot articulate connections to other parts of the discipline or with other disciplines. | Candidate displays solid content knowledge & makes connections with content and other parts of the discipline or with other disciplines. |
| **Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning** | Teacher Candidate displays general understanding of the different approaches to learning that students exhibit, including handicapping conditions. | Teacher Candidate displays solid understanding of the different approaches to learning that different students exhibit, including handicapping conditions. |
| **Balance** | Goals reflect several types of learning but no effort at coordination or integration. | Goals reflect several different types of learning and opportunities for integration. |
| **Management of Transitions** | Transitions are sporadically efficient, resulting in some loss of instructional time. | Transitions occur smoothly, with little loss of instructional time. |
| **Management of Materials and Supplies** | Routines for handing materials and supplies function moderately well | Routines for handling materials and supplies occur smoothly, with little loss of instructional time. |
| **Directions and Procedures** | Candidate directions and procedures are clarified after initial student confusion or are too detailed. | Candidate directions and procedures are clear to students and contain an appropriate level of detail. |
| **Oral and Written Language** | Teacher Candidate's spoken language is audible, and written language is legible. Both are used correctly. Vocabulary is correct but limited or is not appropriate to students' ages or backgrounds. | Teacher Candidate's spoken and written language is clear and correct. Vocabulary is appropriate to students' age and interests. |
| **Structure and Pacing** | The lesson has a recognizable structure, although it is not uniformly maintained throughout the lesson. Pacing is inconsistent. | The lesson has a clearly defined structure around which the activities are organized. Pacing of the lesson is generally consistent. |
| **Quality: Accurate, Substantive, Constructive, and Specific** | Feedback is inconsistent in quality: Some elements of high quality are present; others are not. | Feedback is consistently high quality. |
| **Response to Students** | Teacher Candidate attempts to accommodate students' questions or interests. The effects on the coherence of a lesson are uneven. | Teacher Candidate successfully accommodates students' questions or interests. |

# ASSIGNMENT 2:

# Master in Teaching Program
# EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning Project

# Fall and Spring Quarters, Year 2

# The Evergreen State College

# Master in Teaching Program
# EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning Project

**This project description was developed using MIT's *Student Teaching Rubric*, guidelines for the MIT EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning Project, guidelines for the State of Washington Performance-Based Pedagogy Assessment of Teacher Candidates, and** *The Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality Project* *http://edtech.wku.edu/rubric*

# Teaching Processes Assessed by the *EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning* Project

**Contextual Factors:** *The teacher uses information about the learning-teaching context, cultural contexts, and students' developmental and individual differences to set learning goals and plan instruction and assessment.*
- Knowledge of community, school, and classroom factors
- Knowledge of characteristics of students
- Knowledge of students' varied approaches to learning
- Knowledge of students' skills and prior learning
- Implications for instructional planning and assessment

**Learning Goals:** *The teacher sets significant, challenging, varied and appropriate learning goals that are conceptually based and suitable for diverse learners.*
- Significance, challenge, and variety
- Clarity
- Appropriateness for students
- Alignment with national, state or local standards

**Assessment Plan:** *The teacher uses multiple assessment modes and approaches aligned with learning goals to assess student learning before, during, and after instruction.*
- Alignment with learning goals and instruction
- Clarity of criteria for performance
- Multiple modes and approaches
- Technical soundness
- Adaptations based on the individual needs of students

**Design for Instruction:** *The teacher designs instruction for specific learning goals, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts.*
- Alignment with learning goals
- Accurate representation of content
- Lesson and unit structure
- Use of a variety of instruction, activities, assignments, and resources
- Use of contextual information and data to select appropriate and relevant activities, assignments and resources.
- Use of technology

**Instructional Decision-Making:** *The teacher uses assessment data to profile student learning and communicate information about student progress and achievement.*
- Sound professional practice
- Adjustments based on analysis of student learning
- Congruence between modifications and learning goals

**Analysis of Student Learning:** *The teacher uses assessment data to profile student learning and communicate information about student progress and achievement.*
- Clarity and accuracy of presentation
- Alignment with learning goals
- Interpretation of data
- Evidence of impact on student learning

**Reflection and Self-Evaluation:** *The teacher reflects on her/his instruction and student learning in order to improve teaching practice.*
- Interpretation of student learning
- Insights about effective instruction and assessment
- Alignment among goals, instruction, and assessment
- Implications for future teaching
- Implications for professional development

*http://edtech.wku.edu/rubric*

## EALR/POSITIVE IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING PROJECT

***Definition and Description of the Project***

Through the EALR/POSITIVE IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING Project, the Teacher Candidate systematically documents the learning of the whole class and a representative sample of students during a unit of instruction as well as the teacher candidate's positive impact on student learning. The project is typically completed during the solo student teaching experience or during the phase of co-teaching when the candidate is acting as lead teacher. The Teacher Candidate uses her/his knowledge of relevant classroom, school, community, and student contexts; knowledge of culturally appropriate, multi-cultural, anti-bias teaching; knowledge of student characteristics; knowledge of state learning goals; and knowledge of content, pedagogy and assessment to develop, implement, assess, and adjust learning experiences for students. In addition to using pre, formative, and post assessments for the entire class, the teacher candidate selects 3-5 students of various ability levels and closely monitors the students' development toward mastery of 1-2 of the unit's Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs), Performance Expectations (math), Grade Level Expectations (GLEs), or Frameworks. The planning of the curricular unit, its assessment, the teacher candidate's positive impact on student learning, and the teacher candidate's reflections are documented through this project. **The purpose of this project is to demonstrate positive impact on K-12 student growth in the chosen goals as a result of the Teacher Candidate's teaching.**

***Goals of the Project***

The EALR/Positive Impact project is an essential aspect of the MIT program, serving six important purposes related to Standard V.

1. First, the project assesses candidates' abilities to articulate clear learning targets aligned with the EALRs, GLEs, Frameworks and Performance Expectations.

2. Second, it assesses candidates' abilities to use pre and formative assessments to shape learning experiences to meet students' varied needs.

3. A third purpose is to assess candidates' skills in using post assessment to determine students' progress toward the learning targets.

4. Fourth, the project provides an opportunity for candidates to refine their reflective skills and to use data to articulate what worked in a lesson and what needs to be changed in order to support students' learning.

5. The fifth purpose of the project is to support the candidate in collecting evidence to show that they have met state requirements embedded in the *Pedagogy Assessment.*

6. Finally, the EALR project allows the candidate to demonstrate her/his ***Positive Impact on Student Learning***. Specifically, the candidates must demonstrate the ability to use ***student*** "voice", NOT the candidates' attitudes, lesson plans, instructional skills, etc., to demonstrate that the ***student*** can:
   - identify what she/he is learning and why the learning is important
   - explain where she/he is in the process and what her/his strategies, next steps, and resources are

***Candidate Assignment***

During your student teaching weeks you will design and teach a comprehensive unit. The EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning Project assesses your ability to support student learning by focusing on seven teaching processes identified by research and best practice as fundamental to improving student learning (*http://edtech.wku.edu/rubric*). Each teaching process described in this packet is followed by standards, guidelines for completing the task, and a rubric that defines various levels of performance on the standard. The Standards and Rubrics will be used to evaluate your Project. The guidelines help you document the extent to which you have met each standard. **Before** you teach the unit, you will describe contextual factors, identify learning goals based on state content standards, create an assessment plan designed to measure student metacognitive and academic performance before (pre-assessment), during (formative assessment) and after (post-assessment) the unit, and plan for your instruction. **After** you teach the unit, you will analyze student learning and then reflect upon and evaluate your teaching as related to student learning.

***Assessment Documentation***

This is primarily a ***student*** assessment project. It determines students' growth toward target EALRs, GLEs, Performance Expectations, and Frameworks as well as the candidates' positive impact on student learning. The core assessment documentation includes:

- Pre-assessment instruments and results, showing each selected student's knowledge and skills in relation to the unit's EALRs, GLEs, Performance Expectations, or Frameworks (see Assessment Plan);
- Formative assessment instruments and assessment results showing student learning at multiple points during the implementation of the curricular unit;
- Summative assessment instruments and assessment results documenting student learning at the conclusion of the unit (see Assessment Plan);
- Positive Impact on Student Learning evidence: Written notes from interviews with each of the 3 – 5 targeted students (two interviews per student at different times during the project) or other written evidence such as exit slips, student self reflections or goal setting forms, etc. describing their responses to the following questions: What learning outcome are you working toward? Why is this learning important? How is your learning being evaluated? What progress have you made with regards to this learning? How do you know? What steps would you need to take next? What resources might you use? (see Assessment Plan)
- A chart illustrating whole class results of assessments over time (see Assessment Plan)
- Charts illustrating individual results of assessments over time (see Assessment Plan)
- A self-reflection and evaluation that uses the assessment results to create a written narrative that describes the unit's impact on student learning. This narrative includes information gathered in the Positive Impact Interviews as well as the candidate's reflections about how this information might inform his/her teaching (see Reflection and Self-Evaluation).

***Meeting Washington State PPA Requirements***

The EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning project is integrated with the written sources of evidence required for the State of Washington's Pedagogy-Based Assessment. The information you provide about your classroom, students, planning rationale, lesson/unit plans will meet the needs of both the EALR project and the state pedagogy assessment. **We strongly urge you to design your EALR project to include the lessons to be observed as part of the Pedagogy Assessment.** (See pages 50-56 in Section 2 of the MIT Student Teaching Handbook). Specifically, the EALR project documentation must include:

- Classroom characteristics: describe the classroom in which you are teaching the unit. You should also describe the classroom rules and routines, physical arrangements, and grouping patterns that

affect learning and teaching;

- Student characteristics: describe the students in the classroom, including the number of students and their ages and gender, range of abilities, cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds, native language(s) and levels of English proficiency, and special needs. You should specifically note students who are on Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) and any objectives cited in the IEPs that pertain to the unit you are teaching. (Section 2 of the *Student Teaching Handbook*: Classroom and Student Characteristics on page 52).
- Instructional Plans for each of the lessons related to the EALR project that follow the guidelines of the State Pedagogy Assessment Instrument. (Section 2 of the *Student Teaching Handbook*: The Instructional Plan on pages 53-54)
- Instructional Plan Rationale for the lessons related to the EALR project that follows the Pedagogy Assessment guidelines. (Section 2 of the *Student Teaching Handbook*: Instructional Plan Rationale on page 55-56).
- Samples of your students' work during the unit that provide visual evidence of their learning and/or degree of mastery of the intended learning outcomes.

***Format***

- Ownership. Complete a cover page that includes (a) your name, (b) date submitted, (c) grade level taught, (d) subject taught, and (e) title and length of unit.
- Footer: use Footer to put your **LAST NAME-MiT09** on all pages in the left corner and page numbers in right hand corner
- Table of Contents. Provide a Table of Contents that lists the sections and attachments in your document with page numbers.
- Charts, graphs and attachments. Copies of student work, assessment instruments, and charts or graphs depicting assessment results are required as part of the document. Make sure these items provide clear, concise evidence of your performance related to the standards and your students' learning progress.
- References and Credits. If you referred to another person's ideas or material in your narrative, you should cite these in a separate section at the end of your narrative under *References and Credits* using the American Psychological Association (APA) Style.
- Anonymity. In order to insure the anonymity of students in your class, do not include any student names or identification in any part of your project.

***Submission Requirements***

- The completed (hard copy) EALR/Positive Impact project documentation should be placed in the Student Teaching Portfolio. (This will not be returned.)
- Complete a self-assessment (ELECTRONICALLY) on the rubric of the 7 components, including page numbers where evidence for each criterion is located.
- Submit an electronic version of the EALR project, **as one PDF File** – this version need not contain copies of individual student work that is included in the written version.
- Teacher Candidates are also encouraged to make a copy for their own professional records of the entire document that they eventually submit to their faculty.

## 1. Contextual Factors

Standard *PPA 2: The teacher candidate demonstrates knowledge of the characteristics of students and their communities.*

Standard *MIT Student Teaching Rubric 1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students* and *1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources*

**BEFORE** you begin developing goals and learning experiences for your EALR/Positive Impact Project, consider and discuss the points under the Guidelines below. Use this information to guide your decisions about learning goals and assessment. Then, in this narrative, discuss relevant factors and how they may affect the teaching-learning process. Include any supports and challenges that affect instruction and student learning. Use the *PPA Chart, Classroom and Student Characteristics* to help you.

**Guidelines:** In your narrative, include the following components:

- **Community, district, and school factors.** Address geographic location, community and school population, socio-economic profile and race/ethnicity. You might also address such things as stability of community, political climate, community support for education, and other environmental factors.
- **Classroom factors.** Address physical features, availability of technology equipment and resources, and the extent of parental involvement. You might also discuss other relevant factors such as classroom rules and routines, grouping patterns, scheduling, and classroom arrangement.
- **Student characteristics.** Address student characteristics you must consider as you design instruction and assess learning. Include factors such as age, gender, race/ethnicity, special needs, achievement/developmental levels, culture, language, interests, learning styles/modalities or students' skill levels. In your narrative, make sure you address student's skills and prior learning that may influence the development of your learning goals, instruction, and assessment. Include student characteristics form (p.52), and 3 profiles of case study students to be followed.
- **Instructional implications.** Address how contextual characteristics of the community, classroom, and students have implications for instructional planning and assessment. Include specific instructional implications for at least two characteristics and any other factors that will influence how you plan and implement your unit.

## 2. Learning Goals

Standard *PPA 1: The teacher candidate sets learning targets that address the Essential Academic Learning Requirements and the state learning goals.*

Standard *MIT Student Teaching Rubric 1c: Selecting instructional goals in the context of key concepts.*

**Guidelines:**

- **List the learning goals** (not the activities) that will guide the planning, delivery, and assessment of your unit. These goals should define what you expect students to know and be able to do at the end of the unit. The goals should be significant (reflect the big ideas, i.e. concepts), challenging, varied, and appropriate. Number or code each learning goal so you can reference it later. In the language of the student teaching rubric this means to list your

"**instructional goals and key concepts**". Expressing the same idea using different words, the WA state rubric asks you to list your "learning targets".

- **Show how the goals are aligned with state standards**. That is, identify the Washington **Essential Academic Learning Requirements** most central to this lesson's outcomes (match the lesson's concepts, goals, or objectives to one or more EALRs).
- **Describe the types and levels of your learning goals (Bloom's)**.
- **Describe your essential questions for unit in relationship to the learning goals.**
- **Discuss why your learning goals and essential questions are appropriate in terms of student development; necessary pre-requisite knowledge, skills; and other student needs**. Refer back to your discussion of Contextual Factors.

## 3. Assessment Plan

Standard *PPA 4*: *The teacher candidate designs assessment strategies that measure student learning.*

Standard *MIT Student Teaching Rubric 1f: Assessing Student Learning*

**Guidelines:** With your learning goals and concepts determined, you are ready to design an assessment plan to monitor student progress toward learning goal(s) and to determine YOUR positive impact on student learning. Use multiple assessment modes and approaches aligned with learning goals to assess student learning before, during, and after instruction. These assessments should authentically measure student learning and may include performance-based tasks, paper-and-pencil tasks, or personal communication. Describe why your assessments are appropriate for measuring learning.

- **Provide an overview of the assessment plan.** For each learning goal include: assessments used to judge student performance, format of each assessment, and adaptations of the assessments for the individual needs of students based on pre-assessment and contextual factors. The purpose of this overview is to depict the alignment between learning goals and assessments and to show adaptations to meet the individual needs of students or contextual factors. You will create a visual organizer such as a table, outline or other means to make your plan clear.
- **Describe the pre- and post-assessments that are aligned with your learning goals**. State the plan for **pre-assessing** students' knowledge and abilities in relation to the lesson targets or goals. Describe the **summative** assessment procedures that will be used to gather feedback on student learning at the conclusion of the lesson. Clearly explain how you will evaluate or score pre- and post-assessments, including criteria you will use to determine if the students' performance meets the learning goals. Include copies of assessments, prompts, and/or student directions and criteria for judging student performance (e.g., scoring rubrics, observation checklist, rating scales, item weights, test blueprint, answer key).
- **Discuss your plan for formative assessments that will be used to gather feedback on student learning during the unit.** Describe the assessments you plan to use to check on student progress and comment on the importance of collecting that particular evidence. Although formative assessment may change as you are teaching the unit, your task here is to predict at what points in your teaching it will be important to assess students' progress toward learning goals.
- **Describe how you will determine positive impact on student learning.** What strategies will

you use to determine if students understand the learning goals, can self-assess progress, and can suggest ways to continue making progress toward goals? How will you adapt these strategies to meet individual students' cultural, language, physical, or cognitive differences?

## 4. Design for Instruction

Standard *PPA 5: The teacher candidate designs instruction based on research and principles of effective practice.*

Standard *MIT Student Teaching Rubric 1e: Designing coherent instruction.*

**Guidelines:** Describe how you will design your unit instruction related to unit goals, students' characteristics and needs, and the specific learning context.

- **Results of pre-assessment.** After administering the pre-assessment, analyze student performance *relative to the learning goals.* Depict the results of the pre-assessment in a format that allows you to find patterns of student performance relative to each learning goal. You may use a table, graph, or chart. Describe the pattern you find that will guide your instruction or modification of the learning goals.
- **Unit overview.** Provide an overview of your unit. Use a visual organizer such as a chart or outline to make your unit plan clear. Include the topic or learning activity you are planning for each day/period. Also indicate the goal or goals (coded from your Learning Goals section) that you are addressing in each activity. Make sure that every goal is addressed by at least one activity and that every activity relates to at least one goal.
- **Learning Activities.** Describe the (developmentally appropriate) **student learning activities** to be used in this lesson to meet the stated goals, targets, etc. Describe at least three unit activities that reflect a variety of instructional strategies/techniques and explain why you are planning those specific activities. In your explanation for each activity, include:
  - how the content relates to your instructional goal(s),
  - how the activity stems from your pre-assessment information and contextual factors, including special needs, language diversity, cultural diversity
  - what materials/technology you will need to implement the activity, and
  - how you plan to assess student learning during and/or following the activity (i.e., formative assessment).
- **Technology.** Describe how you will use technology in your planning and/or instruction. If you do not plan to use any form of technology, provide your clear rationale for its omission.
- **Other instructional resources:** Specify the **instructional resources** needed for the student learning activities.
- Specify the **teaching procedures** that will be used to achieve the lesson's intended outcome. Note that this requires information that is in addition to the student learning activities. For example, depending on the particular lesson, it may be important to specify: what the teacher will say to introduce the lesson and/or connect it with prior learning, how long each part of the lesson will last, the planned core questions the teacher will ask, and/or the strategy for moving smoothly from one phase of the lesson to the next.

Note: **Lesson Plan Components**
Although the Teacher Candidate is given the opportunity to select and refine his/her own lesson plan format, there are several components that need to be included in all student teaching lesson plans.

These “minimum components” are outlined in Section 1 of the Student Teaching Handbook, page 13 . Including these required components helps ensure that the Teacher Candidate has not missed any of the planning “basics”. The criteria for assessing the adequacy of lesson planning can be found on the MIT Assessment Rubric (see Components 1c, 1e, and 4a).

## 5. Instructional Decision-Making

Standard *MIT Student Teaching Rubric 4a: Reflecting on Teaching.*

**Guidelines** Identify from your unit two examples of YOUR instructional decision-making based on students’ learning or responses.

- Think of a time during your unit when a student’s learning or response caused you to modify your original design for instruction. (The resulting modification may affect other students as well.) Cite specific evidence to support your answers to the following:
  - Describe the student’s learning or response that caused you to rethink your plans. The student’s learning or response may come from a planned formative assessment, a positive impact assessment, or another source (not the pre-assessment).
  - Describe what you did next and explain why you thought this would improve student progress toward the learning goal.
- Now, think of one more time during your unit when another student’s learning or response caused you to modify a different portion of your original design for instruction. (The resulting modification may affect other students as well.) Cite specific evidence to support your answers to the following:
  - Describe the student’s learning or response that caused you to rethink your plans. The student’s learning or response may come from a planned formative assessment, a positive impact assessment, or another source (not the pre-assessment).
  - Describe what you did next and explain why you thought this would improve student progress toward the learning goal.

## 6.Analysis of Student Learning

Standard *PPA 10: The teacher and students engage in activities that assess student learning.*

Standard *MIT Student Teaching Rubric 4a: Reflecting on Teaching.*

**Guidelines:** Analyze your assessment data, including pre/post assessments and formative assessments to determine students’ progress related to the unit learning goals. Use visual representations and narrative to communicate the performance of the whole class and three individual students. Also analyze students’ positive impact on student learning notes or interviews. Conclusions drawn from these analyses should be provided in the “Reflection and Self-Evaluation” section.

**Guidelines:** In this section, you will analyze data to explain progress and achievement toward learning goals demonstrated by your whole class and 3 selected individual students.

- **Whole class.** To analyze the progress of your whole class, create a table that shows pre- and post-assessment data on every student on every learning goal. Then, create a graphic summary that shows the extent to which your students made progress (from pre- to post-) toward the learning criterion that you identified for each learning goal (identified in your Assessment Plan section). Summarize what the graph tells you about your students' learning in this unit (i.e., the number of students who met the criterion).
- **Subgroups.** Select a group characteristic (e.g., gender, performance level, socio-economic status, language proficiency) to analyze in terms of **one learning goal**. Provide a rationale for your selection of this characteristic to form subgroups (e.g., girls vs. boys; high- vs. middle- vs. low-performers).
- **Create a graphic representation** that compares pre- and post-assessment results for the subgroups on this learning goal. Summarize what these data show about student learning.
- **Individuals.** Select three students who represent different levels of performance. Explain why it is important to understand the learning of these particular students. Use pre-, formative, and post-assessment data with examples of the students' work to draw conclusions about the extent to which these students attained the two learning goals.

***Note**: You will provide possible reasons for why your students learned (or did not learn) in the next section "Reflection and Self-Evaluation."*

## 7. Reflection and Self-Evaluation

Standard *MIT Student Teaching Rubric 4a: Reflecting on Teaching.*

**Task:** Reflect on your performance as a teacher and link your performance to student learning results. Evaluate your performance and identify future actions for improved practice and professional growth. Think of this in terms of identifying goals for you *Professional Development Plan.*

**Guidelines**

- Select the learning goal where your students were most successful, sharing your perceptions about the lesson's effectiveness. Provide two or more possible reasons for this success. Consider your goals, instruction, and assessment along with student characteristics and other contextual factors under your control.
- Select the learning goal where your students were least successful, sharing your suggestions about how the lesson might be improved "the next time". Provide two or more possible reasons for this lack of success. Consider your goals, instruction, and assessment along with student characteristics and other contextual factors under your control. Discuss what you could do differently or better in the future to improve your students' performance.
- **Reflection on possibilities for professional development.** Describe at least two professional Learning goals that emerged from your insights and experiences with the EALR/Positive Impact on Student Learning project. Identify two specific steps you will take to improve your performance in the critical area(s) you identified.

## 1. Contextual Factors Rubric

| RATING ⇒ INDICATOR ⇓ | 1 INDICATOR NOT MET | 2 PARTIALLY MET | 3 INDICATOR MET | EVIDENCE, PAGES |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Knowledge of Cultures, Community, School & Classroom Factors MiT 1b PPA 2 c& f** | Teacher displays minimal, irrelevant, or biased knowledge of the characteristics of the community, cultural groups, school, and classroom. | Teacher displays some knowledge of the characteristics of the community, cultural groups, school, and classroom that may affect learning. | Teacher displays a comprehensive understanding of characteristics of the community, cultural groups, school, and classroom that may affect learning. | |
| **Knowledge of Characteristics of Students MiT 1b PPA 2a & b** | Teacher displays minimal, stereotypical, or irrelevant knowledge of differences (e.g. development, interests, culture, abilities/disabilities). | Teacher displays general knowledge of differences (e.g., development, interests, culture, abilities/disabilities) that affect learning. | Teacher displays general and specific understanding of differences (e.g., development, interests, culture, abilities/disabilities) that affect learning. | |
| **Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning MiT 1b PPA 2d** | Teacher displays minimal, irrelevant or stereotypical, knowledge about different approaches to learning such as learning styles, modalities, different "intelligences" and disabilities | Teacher displays general knowledge about knowledge about different approaches to learning such as learning styles, modalities, different "intelligences" and disabilities | Teacher displays general and specific understanding of different approaches to learning - learning styles, modalities, different "intelligences" and disabilities | |
| **Knowledge of Students' Skills and Prior Learning MiT 1b PPA 2e** | Teacher displays little or irrelevant knowledge of students' skills and prior learning and does not indicate such knowledge is valuable. | Teacher displays general knowledge of students' skills and prior learning that may affect learning but only for the class as a whole. | Teacher displays general and specific understanding of students' skills and prior learning that may affect learning. | |
| **Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment** | Teacher does not provide implications for instruction & assessment based on individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics OR offers inappropriate implications. | Teacher provides general implications for instruction& assessment based on individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics. | Teacher provides specific implications for instruction & assessment based on individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics. | |

## 2. Learning Goals Rubric

| RATING ⇒ INDICATOR ⇓ | 1 INDICATOR NOT MET | 2 PARTIALLY MET | 3 INDICATOR MET | EVIDENCE, PAGES |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Significance, Challenge, and Variety**<br><br>**MiT 1c**<br>**PPA 1b** | Goals reflect only one type or level of learning and one discipline or strand. | Goals reflect several types or levels of learning but lack significance or challenge and/or make no effort at coordination or integration. | Goals reflect several types or levels of learning and are significant and challenging. They offer opportunities for integration of more than one discipline or strand. | |
| **Clarity**<br>**MiT 1c** | Key concepts and goals are not stated clearly or are activities rather than learning outcomes. Goals do not permit viable methods of assessment. | Some goals and key concepts clearly stated as learning outcomes OR are moderately clear. May contain a combination of goals and activities. Some do not permit viable assessment. | Most of the goals and key concepts are clearly stated as learning outcomes and most permit viable methods of assessment. | |
| **Appropriateness For Students**<br><br>**MiT 1c**<br>**PPA 1c** | Goals are not appropriate for the development, prerequisite knowledge, skills, experiences; or other student needs. | Some goals are appropriate for the development, prerequisite knowledge, skills, experiences; and other student needs. | Most goals are appropriate for the development; prerequisite knowledge, skills, experiences; and other student needs. | |
| **Alignment with State, National, or Local Standards**<br><br>**MiT 1c**<br>**PPA 1a** | Goals are not aligned with national, state or local standards. Not reflective of school district's application of EALRs. | Some goals are aligned with national, state or local standards and meet school district's application of EALRS. | Most of the goals are explicitly aligned with state, national, or local standards and are appropriate for meeting school district's application of EALRS. | |

## 3. Assessment Plan Rubric

| RATING ⇒<br>INDICATOR ⇓ | 1<br>INDICATOR NOT MET | 2<br>PARTIALLY MET | 3<br>INDICATOR MET | EVIDENCE, PAGES |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Alignment with Learning Goals and Instruction**<br><br>**MiT 1f**<br>**PPA 4 & 10a** | Content and methods of assessment lack congruence with learning goals and concepts or lack cognitive complexity. | Some of the learning goals are assessed through the plan, but many are not congruent with learning goals in content and cognitive complexity. | Each of the learning goals is assessed through the plan; assessments are congruent with the learning goals in content and cognitive complexity. | |
| **Clarity of Criteria and Standards for Performance**<br><br>**MiT 1f**<br>**PPA 4a & 10d** | The assessments contain no clear criteria for measuring student performance relative to the learning goals. | Assessment criteria have been developed, but they are not clear, are not explicitly linked to the learning goals, or have not been clearly communicated to students. | Assessment criteria are clear, are explicitly linked to the learning goals, and have been clearly communicated to students. | |
| **Multiple Modes and Approaches**<br><br>**PPA 4c & 10b** | The assessment plan includes only one assessment mode and does not assess students before, during, and after instruction. | The assessment plan includes multiple modes but all are either pencil/paper based (i.e. they are not performance assessments) and/or do not require the integration of knowledge, skills and reasoning ability. | The assessment plan includes multiple assessment modes (including performance assessments, lab reports, research projects, etc.) and assesses student performance throughout the instructional sequence. | |
| **Technical Soundness**<br><br>**PPA 4b** | Assessments are not valid; scoring procedures are absent or inaccurate; items or prompts are poorly written; directions and procedures are confusing to students. | Assessments appear to have some validity. Some scoring procedures are explained; some items or prompts are clearly written; some directions and procedures are clear to students. | Assessments appear to be valid; scoring procedures are explained; most items or prompts are clearly written; directions and procedures are clear to students. | |
| **Adaptations Based on the Individual Needs of Students**<br><br>**MiT 1f**<br>**PPA 4d** | Teacher does not adapt assessments to meet the individual needs of students or these assessments are inappropriate. | Teacher makes adaptations to assessments that are appropriate to meet the individual needs of some students. | Teacher makes adaptations to assessments that are appropriate to meet the individual needs of most students. | |

## 4. Design for Instruction Rubric

| RATING ⇒<br>INDICATOR ⇓ | 1<br>INDICATOR NOT MET | 2<br>PARTIALLY MET | 3<br>INDICATOR MET | EVIDENCE, PAGES |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Alignment with Learning Goals**<br><br>**MiT 3c**<br>**PPA 5a** | Few lessons are explicitly linked to learning goals. Few learning activities, assignments and resources are aligned with learning goals. Not all learning goals are covered in design. | Most lessons are explicitly linked to learning goals. Most learning activities, assignments and resources are aligned with learning goals. Most learning goals are covered in design. | All lessons are explicitly linked to learning goals. All learning activities, assignments and resources are aligned with learning goals. All learning goals are covered in design. | |
| **Accurate Representation of Content**<br><br>**MiT 3c**<br>**PPA 6c & d** | Teacher's use of content contains inaccuracies. Content viewed more as isolated skills and facts rather than as part of a larger conceptual structure. | Teacher's use of content appears to be mostly accurate. Shows some awareness of the concepts or structure of the discipline. | Teacher's use of content appears to be accurate. Focus of the content is congruent with the concepts or structure of the discipline. | |
| **Lesson and Unit Structure**<br><br>**MiT 3c**<br>**PPA 5b** | The lessons within the unit are not logically organized (e.g., sequenced). | The lessons within the unit have some logical organization and appear to be somewhat useful in moving students toward achieving the learning goals. | All lessons within the unit are logically organized and appear to be useful in moving students toward achieving the learning goals. | |
| **Variety of Instruction, Activities, Assignments and Resources**<br>**MiT 3c**<br>**PPA 5e, h, 8c** | Little variety of instruction, activities, assignments, and resources. Heavy reliance on textbook or single resource (e.g., work sheets). | Some variety in instruction, activities, assignments, or resources but with limited contribution to learning. | Significant variety across instruction, activities, assignments, and/or resources. Variety clearly contributes to learning. | |
| **Contextual Info and Data to Select Appropriate & Relevant Activities, Assignments & Resources**<br><br>**MiT 3c**<br>**PPA 4B** | Instruction has not been designed with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment data. Activities and assignments do not appear productive and appropriate for each student. | Some instruction has been designed with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment data. Some activities and assignments appear productive and appropriate for each student. | Most instruction has been designed with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment data. Most activities and assignments appear productive and appropriate for each student. | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Use of Technology**<br><br>**MiT 3c**<br>**PPA 8e** | Technology is inappropriately used OR teacher does not use technology, and no (or inappropriate) rationale is provided. | Teacher uses technology but it does not make a significant contribution to teaching and learning OR teacher provides limited rationale for not using technology. | Teacher integrates appropriate technology that makes a significant contribution to teaching and learning OR provides a strong rationale for not using technology. | |

## 5. Instructional Decision-Making Rubric

| RATING ⇒<br>INDICATOR ⇓ | 1<br>INDICATOR NOT MET | 2<br>PARTIALLY MET | 3<br>INDICATOR MET | EVIDENCE, PAGES |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Sound Professional Practice**<br><br>**MiT 4a** | Many instructional decisions are inappropriate and not pedagogically sound. | Instructional decisions are Mostly appropriate, but some decisions not pedagogically sound. | Most instructional decisions are pedagogically sound (i.e., they are likely to lead to student learning). | |
| **Modifications Based on Analysis of Student Learning**<br><br>**MiT 4a** | Teacher treats class as "one plan fits all" with no modifications. | Some modifications of the instructional plan are made to address individual student needs, but these are not based on the analysis of pre-assessment data, student learning, best practice, or contextual factors. | Appropriate modifications of the instructional plan are made to address individual student needs. These modifications are informed by the analysis of student learning/performance data, best practice, or contextual factors. Include explanation of why the modifications would improve student progress. | |
| **Congruence Between Modifications and Learning Goals**<br><br>**MiT 4a** | Modifications in instruction lack congruence with learning goals. | Modifications in instruction are somewhat congruent with learning goals. | Modifications in instruction are congruent with learning goals. | |

## 6.Analysis of Student Learning Rubric

| RATING ⇒ INDICATOR ⇓ | 1 INDICATOR NOT MET | 2 PARTIALLY MET | 3 INDICATOR MET | EVIDENCE, PAGES |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation**<br><br>**MiT 4a**<br>**PPA 10d** | Presentation is not clear and accurate; it does not accurately reflect the data. | Presentation is understandable and contains few errors. | Presentation is easy to understand and contains no errors of representation. | |
| **Alignment with Learning Goals**<br><br>**MiT 4a**<br>**PPA 4a, 10a** | Analysis of student learning is not aligned with learning goals. | Analysis of student learning is partially aligned with learning goals and/or fails to provide a Comprehensive profile of student learning relative to the goals for the whole class, subgroups, and 3 individuals. | Analysis is fully aligned with learning goals and provides a comprehensive profile of student learning for the whole class, subgroups, and 3 individuals. | |
| **Interpretation of Data**<br><br>**MiT 4a**<br>**PPA 10d** | Interpretation is inaccurate and conclusions are missing or unsupported by data. | Interpretation is technically accurate, but conclusions are missing or not fully supported by data. | Interpretation is meaningful, and appropriate conclusions are drawn from the data. | |
| **Evidence of Impact on StudentLearning**<br><br>**MiT4a**<br>**PPA 10g** | Analysis of student learning fails to include evidence of impact on student learning in terms of numbers of students who achieved and made progress toward learning goals. | Analysis of student learning Includes incomplete evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of numbers of students who achieved and made progress toward learning goals. | Analysis of student learning includes evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of number of students who achieved and made progress toward each learning goal. | |

## 7. Reflection and Self-Evaluation Rubric

| RATING ⇒<br>INDICATOR<br>⇓ | 1<br>INDICATOR NOT MET | 2<br>PARTIALLY MET | 3<br>INDICATOR MET | EVIDENCE, PAGES |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Interpretation of Student Learning**<br><br>**MiT 4a** | No evidence or reasons provided to support conclusions drawn in "Analysis of Student Learning" section. | Provides evidence but no (or simplistic, superficial) reasons or hypotheses to support conclusions drawn in "Analysis of Student Learning" section. | Uses evidence to support conclusions drawn in "Analysis of Student Learning" section. Explores multiple hypotheses for why some students did not meet learning goals. | |
| **Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment**<br><br>**MiT4a** | Provides no rationale for why some activities or assessments were more successful than others. | Identifies successful and unsuccessful activities or assessments and superficially explores reasons for their success or lack thereof (no use of theory or research). | Identifies successful and unsuccessful activities and assessments and provides plausible reasons (based on theory or research) for their success or lack thereof. | |
| **Alignment Among Goals, Instruction, and Assessment**<br><br>**MiT4a** | Does not connect learning goals, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction and/or the connections are irrelevant or inaccurate. | Connects learning goals, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction, but misunderstandings or conceptual gaps are present. | Logically connects learning goals, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction. | |
| **Implications for Future Teaching**<br><br>**MiT4a** | Provides no ideas or inappropriate ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment. | Provides ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment but offers no rationale for why these changes would improve student learning. | Provides ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment and explains why these modifications would improve student learning. | |
| **Implications for Professional Development**<br><br>**MiT4a** | Provides no professional learning goals or goals that are not related to the insights and experiences described in this section. | Presents professional learning goals that are not strongly related to the insights and experiences described in this section and/or provides a vague plan for meeting the goals. | Presents a small number of professional learning goals that clearly emerge from the insights and experiences described in this section. Describes specific steps to meet these goals. | |

# ASSIGNMENT 3:

# EALR/POSITIVE IMPACT PROJECT and PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

## Winter Quarter, Year 2

**EALR/POSITIVE IMPACT PROJECT REFLECTION and PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN ASSIGNMENT**

Winter Quarter, Year 2

The EALR project asks you to demonstrate your ability to meet 7 standards:

1. **Contextual Factors Standard:** *The teacher uses information about the learning-teaching context, cultural contexts, and students' developmental and individual characteristics to set learning goals, and plan instruction, and assessment.*

2. **Learning Goals Standard:** *The teacher sets significant, challenging, varied, and appropriate learning goals that are conceptually based and suitable for diverse learners.*

3. **Assessment Plan Standard:** *The teacher uses multiple assessment modes and approaches aligned with learning goals to assess student learning before, during, and after instruction.*

4. **Design for Instruction Standard:** *The teacher designs instruction for specific learning goals, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts.*

5. **Instructional Decision-Making Standard:** *The teacher uses on-going analysis of student learning to make instructional decisions.*

6. **Analysis of Student Learning Standard:** *The teacher uses assessment data to profile student learning and communicate information about student progress and achievement.*

7. **Reflection and Self-Evaluation Standard:** *The teacher reflects on his or her instruction and student learning in order to improve teaching practice.*

Using the sub-questions for each standard (on the Scoring guide handout):

1. Write a reflection on the strengths and weaknesses your EALR project showed in each of the 7 standards listed above.

2. Create a plan of action for revising your EALR project based on identified areas for improvement. Identify 1) parts you can change, and 2) what will you do to make the changes.

3. Bring this written plan and your EALR project to class next week. This reflection as well as your written EALR project will be given to others to assess, so please bring hard copies to be passed around in class!

**EALR/POSITIVE IMPACT PROJECT REFLECTION and PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN ASSIGNMENT - PART 2**

1. Using your action plan, feedback from your peers, and feedback from your faculty, decide which of the 7 standards you most need to develop

2. Choose 3 standards and revise your project to strengthen those areas. Keep in mind how these changes might improve your next EALR/Positive Impact Project, which will be completed in your spring quarter student teaching placement.

3. As you re-write your project, include new learning from assessment books read/discussed this quarter. Make sure to cite applications.

4. Bring to turn in:
    a. Written self-assessment and action plan on the 7 standards
    b. Peer assessment on the 7 standards
    c. Revisions based on 3 of the 7 standards

## PGP Assignment Directions

1. In class, complete Initial Self Assessment

   **DIRECTIONS:** Reflecting on your fall student teaching, and using specific data from your lesson plans, and EALR/Positive Impact project, fill out the initial self assessment with specific teaching practices you engaged in, and list the specific student evidence you have to support your practices.

   Complete your self-assessment using:
   - Feedback from mentor teacher
   - Feedback from principal
   - Feedback from faculty
   - Personal observations

   For each determine:
   1 = Do this all the time, it's an automatic part of my teaching
   2 = Do this occasionally, but not consistent part of my teaching
   3 = Did this only because it was an assignment, not a regular part of my teaching repertoire yet

Based on this self-assessment, identify two areas in Standard 1 and one area in Standard 2 that need improvement.

2. Using these 3 identified areas for professional growth, complete the **PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATE PROFESSIONAL GROWTH PLAN** Sections 1-4 for **3** of the 12 criteria (two from standard 1 and one from Standard 2)

Contextualize your growth to focus on improvements needed shown from your student teaching, and that you can work on this quarter in your seminar readings and contract work and that you can show specific evidence in your own growth through documentation this quarter, and implementation in spring quarter.

Submit electronically:
1) the Self Assessment (as evidence of your ability as a professional to self-assess and plan for professional growth)
2) the **PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATE PROFESSIONAL GROWTH PLAN**

# PROFESSIONAL GROWTH PLAN
# (PGP)

| Standard/Criterion | Comments |
|---|---|
| **1 Effective Teaching** | |
| (a) Using instructional strategies that make learning meaningful and show positive impact on student learning | |
| (b) Using a variety of assessment strategies and data to monitor and improve instruction | |
| (c) Using appropriate classroom management principles, processes and practices to foster a safe, positive, student-focused learning environment | |
| (d) Designing and/or adapting challenging curriculum that is based on the diverse needs of each student | |
| (e) Demonstrating cultural sensitivity in teaching and in relationships with students, families, and community members | |
| (f) Integrating technology into instruction and assessment | |
| (g) Informing, involving, and collaborating with families and community members as partners in each student's educational process, including using information about student achievement and performance. | |
| **2 Professional Development** | |
| (a) Evaluating the effects of his/her teaching through feedback and reflection; | |
| (b) Using professional standards and district criteria to assess professional performance, and plan and implement appropriate growth activities | |
| (c) Remaining current in subject area(s), theories, practice, research and ethical practice | |
| **3 Professional Contributions** | |
| (a) Advocating for curriculum, instruction, and learning environments that meet the diverse needs of each student | |
| (b) Participating collaboratively in school improvement activities and contributing to collegial decision-making. | |

**Professional Growth Plan**
**Initial Self Assessment**

| ***Standard 1: Effective Teaching*** | **Summary of teacher practice** | **Student evidence** |
|---|---|---|
| 1(a) Using effective teaching practices including classroom management | | |
| 1(b) Using assessment to monitor and improve instruction | | |
| 1(c) Establishing and maintaining a positive, student-focused learning environment | | |
| 1(d) Designing and/or adapting challenging curriculum that is developmentally appropriate | | |
| 1(e) Demonstrating cultural sensitivity in teaching and in relationships with students, parents, and community | | |
| 1(f) Using information about student achievement and performance to advise and involve students, parents, and community members | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1(g) Integrating technology into instruction and assessment | | |
| 1(h) Informing, involving, and collaborating with parents and families as partners in the educational process | | |
| 1(i) Incorporating democratic principles into his/her practice | | |
| ***Standard 2: Professional Development*** | | |
| 2(a) Evaluating the effects of his/her teaching through feedback and reflection | | |
| 2(b) Designing and implementing personal professional growth programs | | |
| 2(c) Remaining current in subject area(s), theories, practice, research, and ethical practice | | |

| ***Standard 3: Leadership*** | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3(a) Participating in activities within the school community to improve curriculum and instructional practice | | |
| 3(b) Participating in professional and/or community organizations | | |
| 3(c) Advocating in curriculum, instruction, and learning environments which meet the diverse needs of students | | |